

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested. Claims 1-12 are currently pending, with claims 4-8 and 10 having been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-3, 9, 11 and 12 are currently under examination.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claim 9. In addition, the Examiner has not addressed the patentability of claims 2 and 3, other than rejecting these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph. Because the Examiner has not set forth any prior art rejection of these claims, Applicant assumes the Examiner considers the subject matter set forth in these claims patentable. By way of this response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11 to include features somewhat similar to those previously set forth in claim 2. The additional amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been made to further clarify the features previously set forth.

Moreover, because the Examiner has not set forth any prior art rejection of claims 2 and 3, and Applicant has amended claim 1 to include features at least somewhat similar to claim 2, if the Examiner does not believe claim 1 is in condition for allowance, Applicant asserts the next Office Action should be made **non-final** in order to give Applicant proper opportunity to respond.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the restriction of claims 4-8 and 10, Applicant acknowledges this restriction.

DRAWINGS

The Examiner suggests labeling FIGS. 18-31 "PRIOR ART." By way of the replacement sheets of drawings filed herewith, Applicant has labeled FIGS. 18-31 as suggested by the Examiner.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objects to claims 1 and 9 due to various informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 taking into account the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1-3 and 11 taking into account the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0033787 ("Park").

In rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner alleges AAPA and Park in combination render this claim obvious. Particularly, the Examiner relies upon the gate clock signal GCK and gate start pulse GSP of AAPA to allegedly teach the "row drive timing signal," of claim 1. However, Applicant

disagrees because neither AAPA nor Park, either alone or in combination, teach or fairly suggest at least "a row drive timing signal," including *"a pulse shifted start pulse signal for determining timings to serially output the row drive signals to respective row lines; and a shift clock signal for determining a timing to shift the start pulse signal,"* as required by claim 1.

In the timing control ASIC 108 in FIG. 28 of AAPA, a horizontal counter 108b begins counting clocks of clock signal CK from the reference timing for horizontal drive, while a vertical counter 108c begins counting rising edges of the ENAB signal from the reference timing of vertical drive. Horizontal signal timing generation block 108d generates and outputs gate clock signal GCK, latch strobe signal LS, source clock signal SCK, and source start pulse signal SSP in accordance with the result of the counting by the horizontal counter 108b. Vertical signal timing generation block 108e generates and outputs gate start pulse signal GSP in accordance with the result of the counting by the vertical counter 108c. A liquid crystal drive inversion signal generation block 108f generates and outputs the liquid crystal drive inversion signal REV in accordance with the results of the counting by the horizontal counter 108b and vertical counter 108c. Input data signal DATAin is supplied to an input buffer 108g, and the input data signal DATAin is output from an output buffer 108h as output data.

In the display device disclosed in FIG. 28 of AAPA, the vertical and horizontal synchronizing signals are not supplied to the timing controller ASIC. AAPA, p. 14, ll. 10-13. As a result, the gate start pulse signal GSP must be

generated from a pulse of the data enable signal ENAB supplied at the timing of inputting the data DH1 of the first line. *Id.* at ll. 13-16. Contrary to AAPA, however, the "row drive timing signal," of claim 1 includes "a pulse shifted start pulse signal for determining timings to serially output the row drive signals to respective row lines; and a *shift clock signal for determining a timing to shift the start pulse signal.*" Therefore, the gate clock signal GCK and the gate start pulse signal GSP of AAPA do not constitute the "row drive timing signal," of claim 1 because the timing of gate start pulse signal GSP of AAPA is generated from the data enable signal ENAB supplied at the timing of inputting the data DH1 of the first line, but not determined from the gate clock signal, assuming *arguendo* the gate clock signal constituted the "*shift clock signal,*" of claim 1 (which Applicant does not admit).

In Park, a circuit 200 receives a vertical synchronizing signal VS and a data enable signal DE and produces a dummy gate signal, having a period 1H preceding the high period of the first gate signal. *See, e.g., Park*, FIG. 6. However, Park also fails to teach or suggest at least "a row drive timing signal," including "a pulse shifted start pulse signal for determining timings to serially output the row drive signals to respective row lines; and a shift clock signal for determining a timing to shift the start pulse signal," as required by claim 1. Therefore, AAPA and Park, taken singly or in combination, do not render claim 1 obvious because the combination of these references (assuming *arguendo* the combination is proper, which Applicant does not admit) fails to teach or fairly suggest all features of claim 1. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j).

The combination of AAPA and Park also fails to teach or fairly suggest all features of independent claims 11 and 12 for at least reasons somewhat similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 11 and 12 is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant hereby petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submits the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number of the undersigned listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Donald J. Daley
Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/AMW

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000